

## REMARKS

The examiner rejected claim 1 as being obvious over Hardy, Jr. et al. in view of Sorkin or Yelsma.

The applicant has amended the claims to add a feature not found in the prior art which is believed to make the claims allowable.

As described on page 5 line 1-11 of the application and shown in the drawings a shoulder 17 adjacent the columns 13 allows arms 15 to be recessed in above the U shaped clip portion 12 to allow the rebars 20 in or out of the clip when the arms are recessed over the shoulder. Since none of the prior art has this feature it is believed the claims are allowable.

It should be noted that in the design of Hardy, Jr. et al., as shown, the arms, without the recessed space, have no place to move out of the way to allow a rebar access to the cradle.

Further claim 1 has been amended to show that there is only one clip rather than two or more in Hardy, Jr. et al. or Sorkin.

With claim 1 now allowable all the claims including the withdrawn claims are believed to be allowable.